

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff(s),
v.
CALVIN BRYANT, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:24-cr-00063-JCM-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 102]

Pending before the Court is a stipulated protective order. Docket No. 102.

“At any time the court may, for good cause, deny, restrict, or defer discovery or inspection, or grant other appropriate relief.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 16(d)(1). Such relief is subject to wide judicial discretion. *United States v. Amaralaborde*, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 70694, at *2 (D. Nev. May 9, 2017) (citing *in re Terrorist Bombings of U.S. Embassies in E. Africa*, 552 F.3d 93, 122 (2d Cir. 2008)).

The instant request is centered on representations that intercepted communications might contain personal identifying information and that redacting this information (if it exists) would be burdensome. Docket No. 102 at 2. The Government has not represented that sensitive information actually exists in the subject documents and relies on conclusory assertions that the “voluminous” nature of the documents renders redaction burdensome. Neither showing is sufficiently concrete or fulsome to establish good cause for a protective order.

As good cause has not been shown, the stipulated protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 28, 2024


Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge